OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
HYGIENIC LABORATORY
TWENTY-FIFTH AND E STREETS NW.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

UNITED STATES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

3755

November 13, 1923.

Mr. Scudder
Librarian
U. S. National Museum
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Scudder:

Our messenger tells me that you wish for your library files a copy of my discussion of Evolution from Mr. Bryan's point of view, and in accordance with this message I am enclosing herewith a carbon copy of the manuscript.

Very cordially yours,

C. W. Stiles, Professor.

CWS/jc

Smithsonian Institution
NOV 17 1923
National Museum

MSS
1637 A
RB
NMAH

DSI

BRYAN'S REVOLUTION AGAINST EVOLUTION.a/

a/ Presented to the Biological Society of Washington, D. C., March 31, 1923.

By his (self-appointed) Attorney-on-Germs, C. W. Stiles, Ph.D., L.L.D.

Smithsonian Institution
NOV 17 1923
262713
National Museum

Some of us here this evening can recall the lifting of eye-brows and other marks of disapproval, or even of disdain, which met the person who, years ago, dared to express his concurrence in the general principles of that invention, by his satanic majesty, known as the Theory of Evolution. We were confronted with the first and second chapters of Genesis as establishing facts which it was both sacrilege and insanity to study critically. And probably some of you are surprised that a very noted authority on metallurgy, our professional Brother, Mr. Bryan, scientifically known especially because of his 16 to 1 Theory of Relativity, should now revert to questions which were in the fore in decades gone by.

May I invite your attention to two phases of this resurrection which are of more than passing interest.

The first point is that Brother Bryan's position is in thorough harmony with the Theory of Evolution, for it is simply an instance of reversion to a former, ancestral, type or stage of development, known as Atavism. These examples of Atavism are not uncommon in Nature and are deserving of careful scientific study.

The second point is that Brother Bryan's contentions, if well founded, give us sound basis for scientific deductions in respect to the history of medicine which are far beyond the data now ordinarily accepted as established.

Let us accept as our major premise the first two chapters of Genesis and considering them in the light of facts as to the cause of certain diseases, let us see what we can logically deduce in respect to health conditions in the Garden of Eden.

MSS
16 394
HR
NMAH

When Goethe, Wesley, Leidy, Darwin, and their colleagues discussed Evolution, very little was known about the germ theory of disease; but during the life of the present generation of scientists great advances have been made. From present knowledge, there is no such phenomenon as Spontaneous Generation; hence, according to Bryan's premises, all germs which cause disease must have been created in the beginning as they exist today. This latter conclusion must be accepted as beyond dispute, for if it is to be conceded that those germs were originally created in some form other than as disease germs, and that they later changed their nature and became disease germs, the Theory of Evolution stands ipso facto admitted.

According to our major premise, Genesis, Adam was the last animal created. As Eve was later made by a process of vivisection, under anaesthesia, she is not immediately involved in our Bryanistic argument.

Obviously, since Adam was the last animal created, and since the animals were not created until after the plants, it is unthinkable that any of the numerous germs which produce disease were created after Adam.

Obviously, also, since the disease germs are dependent for their existence and life cycle upon the animals and plants in which they cause disease, it is clear that these germs could not have existed or been created prior to the creation of their victims. A challenge of this deduction would be an admission that the germs were not created as they are today but that they later evolved into disease-germs; but as this would be an admission of Evolution, the challenge is "out of order". The fact that some diseases of plants are caused by parasitic animals and the fact that some diseases of animals are caused by parasitic plants is somewhat disturbing chronologically to our major premise -- but of course we must not question our major premise, for we are presenting Brother Bryan's case before the court.

Facing now the dilemma that (by the terms of the major premise) the disease germs could not have been created after Adam, and that they could not possibly live, as they are today, before the creation of the animals and plants upon which they are dependent for their existence and in which they produce disease, the question arises: When were they created? The best escape from this dilemma appears to be the admission that they must have been created at the same moment as, and in, the respective animals and plants which are necessary to their life. We will not emphasize here the disturbing point that, in this event, it is necessary tacitly to admit that the chronology of the creation of some animals and of some plants is contrary to our major premise.

As some germ diseases occur in more than one kind of plant or in more than one kind of animal, and as our major premise does not give us the exact chronology of the creation of the different kinds of plants and of the different kinds of animals, we are naturally a little embarrassed in an attempt to explain in just what plant or in just what animal certain diseases were created. But then, "What is the Constitution among friends?"

There are however numerous diseases which are known only for man or for which man is, in our present knowledge, necessary for the completion of the life cycle of the disease. It is in connections with these maladies that Brother Bryan's thesis gives us such valuable historical data. Arguing now as the (self-appointed) attorney for Brother Bryan, I respectfully submit to the Court that we must conclude that Adam harbored every germ disease which is characteristic for man or which is dependent upon man for its life cycle; further I submit that if you challenge this Bryanistic deduction you admit the Theory of Evolution.

Arriving at this point, we are in a position logically to conclude that Adam certainly had the majority of the following parasitic troubles, that he

almost certainly had some of the minority of them, and that he represents the most interesting clinical case in the entire medical history of the world.

Of insect parasites, Adam must have had three kinds of lice (the head louse, the body louse, and the pubic louse), certainly one, probably two kinds of fleas (Pulex, Sarcopsylla) and he must have been well acquainted with at least one, probably more than one kind of bedbug (Cimex). As the body-louse carries typhus fever, Adam must have had that disease.

Of the arachnoid parasites, Adam must have had at least two kinds of itch (Sarcoptes, Demodex).

Of the round worm infections, Bryan — I mean — Adam must have had one, probably two, possibly three kinds of hookworm disease, stomach worms combined with an attack of Ascaris pneumonia, pin worms with itching at the nose, whipworms, Cochin-china diarrhea, some form of filariasis — possibly elephantiasis —, Calabar swellings, Onchocerca swellings, and he may have been blind in one eye from Onchocerca caecutiens.

Of the tape worms, he certainly had at least two kinds (Taenia solium, T. saginata), and possibly 6 or 8 others also.

Of the fluke infections, he may have had one liver fluke disease (clonorchiasis), one lung fluke infection(paragonimiasis), and three blood fluke maladies (schistosomiasis, possibly with Jacksonian epilepsy), in addition to the frequently fatal "ginger" disease (fasciolopsiasis).

Of protozoan diseases, he had amoebic dysentery, three kinds of malaria, probably both flagellate and ciliate diarrhea, possibly sleeping sickness (trypanosomiasis), his face was perhaps disfigured with Aleppo boil, and he may have had a polyp in his nose.

Of the recognized bacterial diseases, Adam doubtless had tuberculosis,

leprosy, diphtheria, typhoid, paratyphoid, infantile diarrhea, Asiatic cholera, gonorrhea, and many others.

To this long list should be added mumps, whooping cough, trachoma, yellow fever, yaws, syphilis, scarlet fever, two kinds of measles, influenza, cerebrospinal meningitis, probably infantile paralysis, and possibly small pox.

What wonder is it that Adam lived only 930 years and left no life insurance policy either to his estate or to his family!

This very remarkable clinical history, the most interesting medical case on record, possibly explains the apple incident, since several of the infections mentioned, as the tapeworms and hookworms, are accompanied by an abnormal appetite. No wonder Adam ate the apple; the wonder is he did not eat the snake also.

The hypothesis that Adam may have been blind in one eye possibly explains the fact that Eve handed the apple to him instead of telling him to wait on himself.

Further, if Adam had a certain combination of three of the fluke diseases mentioned, we have valuable evidence that the Garden of Eden was probably located in China.

At least two points of very special technical interest remain to be mentioned.

Some of the diseases which Adam had have very definite periods of incubation and are spread only at certain stages of the malady. From the data before us it would appear that Adam must have had certain of these diseases in active stage within a very few days after his creation, and since some of these are transmissible only during the early stage of infection, and would have died out with Adam if there were no one present to whom they could be communicated, the conclusion would seem justified that the anaesthetic - and - vivisection incident which resulted in Eve must have occurred almost immediately after Adam saw the light of day. This, so far as I know, is the first time that it has been

scientifically proved that Adam was only a few hours - at most a day or so - older than Eve. Anthropologically and matrimonially speaking, this is a fact of very great historic interest. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the first recorded case of vivisection resulted in womankind, the greatest blessing mankind has ever known, it is obvious that Brother Bryan has overthrown all arguments advanced against Science by the anti-vivisectionists.

The chief technical difficulty I experience is to explain how Eve, who must assuredly have contracted mumps and flu, for instance, when she was only a few days old, passed these diseases on to us. Obviously Cain (the first botanist) and Abel (the first zoologist) did not appear until after Adam (the first president of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) had recovered sufficiently to eat apples, and I can not account for the persistence of the germs during the i interval between the time Eve recovered from mumps and flu and the date Cain and Abel contracted these infections. If any of you happen to meet Professor Bryan I wish you would ask him to help me out on this point; any logician who is not disturbed by the fact that the green (namely chlorophyll bearing) plants (which were created on the third day -? or geologic age) could live and flourish without the sun (which was not created until the fourth day) can certainly help us out of a slight technical difficulty like this.

In conclusion, I want to express my keen admiration for Noah not only because of his ability as a sea captain, but also as a hospital superintendent and as a health officer. It is to be recalled that two type specimens of every one of the hundreds of thousands of originally created terrestrial and aerial animals, with all of their food supplies, were taken on board the Ark, and of course they took along with them all of the present known germ diseases, except those which could persist in water in a spore stage or which belong to the aquatic animals. I am now assuming that it was not necessary for the aquatic animals to take passage

on the Ark. Thus it appears that the Ark was in reality more than a ship; it was the first known hospital in the history of the world, either on land or on sea.

For Noah and his family to attend to all of these infectious patients without the loss of a single elephant or hippopotamus, was indeed a remarkable professional and administrative feat - a feat never equaled since then in the history of medicine. Further, also, since many of the diseases are intercommunicable between different species of animals and spread very rapidly, especially in crowded conditions, it is obvious that Noah, with the then existing medical knowledge, by preventing hundreds of serious epidemics and epizootics, on board of the Ark, made a record a s a health officer which no man, even with our present modern medical knowledge, can ever hope to attain.

In summary we see, that any of you prejudiced biologists who, blinded by your one-sided point of view of Science, including Geology, Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, Embryology, Comparative Anatomy, etc., etc., ad finem, refuse to join with Brother Bryan and me in accepting the fact of original creation with all of its corollaries are really standing in the way of our advance of knowledge concerning the history of medicine.